



parlee01.005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
(parlee01.005)

**Applicant:** Robert Parlee

**Paper No.:**

**Application No:** 10/671,078

**Group Art Unit:** 1732

**Filed:** 9/25/03

**Examiner:** Allan R. Kuhns

**Title:** *Techniques for making carbon fiber bicycle frames*

.....

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Supplemental response to a final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

**Background**

Applicant received a first Office action in the above application mailed 4/29/05. After a restriction requirement and election, claims 17 and 19-23 remained for examination. In the first Office action, Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,986,949, Trimble, *Method of making composite bicycle frames*, issued 1/22/91 (henceforth “Trimble”). Examiner graciously granted Applicant a telephonic interview on Wednesday, July 20 at 10:00. Applicant’s attorney submitted an *Argument* to Examiner prior to the interview to aid Examiner in his preparation for the interview. In the interview, Examiner agreed that claim 18 should be included in the group of claims under examination and that the claims as amended in the *Argument* were patentable over Trimble. A response filed July 21, 2005 included the claims as amended in the *Argument* and better stated the differences between Applicant’s techniques and those of Trimble.

In a final Office action in the above patent application mailed 10/03/05, Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2. paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of Applicant’s invention and rejected claims 17,

19-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,019,312, Bishop, *Method for assembling a bicycle frame*, issued 5/28/91 (henceforth “Bishop”). Examiner granted Applicant an interview on Dec. 1 at 10:00. While no agreement was reached in the interview, Applicant’s attorney found it useful in that it gave Applicant’s attorney a better understanding of Examiner’s reading of the reference.

Applicant incorporated this improved understanding into a response which was mailed 12/30/05. In an Advisory Action mailed 1/19, Examiner indicated that the amendment to claim 18 in the response had overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, but that further search was required with regard to the amendments of claims 17 and 19-23. Applicants then telephoned Examiner on 1/26/05 about the state of the claims, and examiner indicated that he might be able to allow claims addressed to the use of silicon as the expandable element without a new search. Applicant is hereby amending his claims in the indicated manner. In making the amendment, Applicant is not conceding that claims 17, 19, 21, and 22 as amended in the response mailed 12/30/05 are obvious over Bishop and reserves the right to file a continuation containing those claims.

**Please amend the claims as follows:**